

of the chute every year was the balanced budget amendment. And we were very close and I feel we will get there this year. It will largely be a tribute to you, sir, when it occurs, to HOWELL HEFLIN.

And always you were supportive and helpful to me. When I would seek your counsel, you would give it in a most honest and refreshing way, with that extraordinary honesty and integrity that is, sadly enough, sometimes lacking, but not always.

But to me, you were a steady, thoughtful friend and very, very wise. I do not know many people who are wise. I know brilliant people. I know thoughtful people. I know intelligent people. You are a combination of all those things, but you have a wisdom and common sense which is enviable.

And in our travels together, you and I have a great common bond, and that is humor; good humor.

I will miss your no-tie Hawkins stories, but not much. And I will share with you the toast to water again, and the great story on whiskey, of course, which is memorable in itself.

But, you and Mike have traveled side by side, as Ann and I have, through many years of life. And that remarkable woman at your side is one of the most special ones to me and to my wife, Ann.

So as you go on to new things, knowing that the actual essence of your life is your good humor, it reminds me of what my mother said—that humor is the universal solvent against the abrasive elements of life.

You have lived that way and you have helped us all by just saying, "Relax. Settle down. We have a job to do. Don't get swept up in the emotion of it."

The counsel, the friendship, the trust you gave to me are deeply appreciated. We have shared much together. You are a very dear friend and we wish you well. Good luck and Godspeed. We will enjoy these many months more of working with you on things that will come to pass simply because of your presence, and the fact that you have decided to leave us will impel us to do things that are left undone that we will get done as a tribute to you.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I join in the tribute to my good friend and colleague.

I recall visiting his home in Tuscumbia, AL, and his lovely wife, Mike, receiving us there. I recall serving on the Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee with him over the years, and I believe we have been on a trip or two with some of these delegations.

So I congratulate him on great service to the United States. It has been a pleasure to serve with you. I think you are an example to all of us of what a

good U.S. Senator is. I wish you all my best.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending legislation, which would provide for disaster relief and for accompanying rescissions.

This is not by any measure a partisan bill—indeed, it was put together by the Appropriations Committee in the same fine bipartisan spirit that has always characterized that committee, and the relationship between two very fine and capable men—Chairman HATFIELD and the ranking member, Senator BYRD.

I do believe, however, that there is good cause for many of us who are now in the majority, to be particularly pleased with this legislation.

If there was one glaring, disturbing symptom of "business as usual" in Washington as practiced for too many recent years, it would be the practice of always saying "yes" to new spending, even when most always failing to make the hard decisions to pay for it.

One category of spending in which this has been most obvious has been the area of disaster relief. It is, of course, entirely fitting and proper that we provide assistance to those who are in need solely because of an "act of God." But we have too often simply appropriated this money, added it to the Federal deficit, and failed to prioritize our spending priorities within existing spending levels.

I joined our distinguished leader, Senator DOLE, during the last session, in attempting to provide for a full spending cut offset during the last time the Senate considered emergency disaster appropriations. We failed in that effort, I am quite sorry to say.

But today we see here a bill that not only provides for needed disaster assistance, but more than makes up for that new spending with an even larger amount of spending cuts. This, to me, means that we have truly arrived at a brand new day in Washington.

Let me assure my colleagues that we do no extra, special service to the victims of disaster, nor to our future generations, by simply adding the tab for such spending to the future national debt. We do not need to be reminded that we will soon be asked to vote the debt limit up to \$5 trillion—an astonishing, incomprehensible, inconceivable figure.

The accumulation of such massive debts does not assist us in our efforts to cope with disasters or to forestall their worst effects. It only undercuts our ability to adequately provide for such work. There has never been a good policy reason to add such spending to accumulating debts.

Rather, the existence of a natural emergency, of a climate of urgency, has simply been used extensively by

this Congress as an excuse—a "good" reason to deficit-spend.

I am so very pleased to stand here today and be considering a bill that will provide for those in need but will not add to the Nation's debt. I think it is notable that the first amendment to this legislation—offered by our fine colleague Senator MIKULSKI—sought not to strike the proposed rescissions from the bill—but rather to replace the targeted, considered rescissions with "across-the-board" cuts.

I opposed that amendment, as I believe the targeted approach to be the better way to prioritize our spending.

I agree with my friend Senator BOND that we appear to assume that existing priorities are perfectly set whenever we attempt across-the-board cuts—though surely they are not. But I take heart in the offered amendment as well—the consideration of such an amendment first shows us that we are in a new atmosphere these days, in which fiscal prudence is considered to be desirable. It shows that the voters indeed drove their message home hard last November.

I feel very pleased that my colleagues will approve the pending rescissions legislation.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, before I propose an amendment, I would like to make a few remarks on the legislation pending before the Senate.

First, I congratulate the managers of the bill, the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I think the \$13 billion that is going to be taken out of the deficit is an important step forward. I think that some very difficult decisions have been made, and I know that the Appropriations Committee has very difficult choices to make.

I do note also that the House has cut \$17 billion, a \$4 billion differential. Many of those, of course, were carefully examined by the Senate Appropriations Committee and were found wanting.

Madam President, earlier, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee recommending \$6.3 billion in low-priority defense and nondefense items funded in the defense budget, as well as several domestic programs.

I do not want to go through all the details, but clearly there was some funding that could have been the subject of a rescission. I regret that they were not included in this package. Things like \$5.8 million—this is out of the defense appropriations budget—\$5.8 million for the National Center for Toxicological Research; National Guard outreach program in the Los Angeles school district; directed allocation of child development funds to the Pacific region; a wild horse roundup at White Sands missile range, New Mexico; electrical service upgrades; natural gas study and infrastructure planning.

Again, these are out of the defense appropriations bill, I emphasize. \$2.5 million—I am sorry, I did not give the amounts—\$2.5 million to establish a land management training center; \$2.2 million for a natural gas study and infrastructure planning; \$1.5 million for a wild horse roundup; \$1 million for improvement of navigational charts for the lower Mississippi River; \$10 million for a Los Angeles school district youth program.

Again, Madam President, many of these funds may be very important and vital, but what happens around here is if you cannot get it into the specific appropriations for which they would normally be attached, then, of course, they are in the defense appropriations because it has such a large amount of money available.

What is \$1 million to improve the navigational charts for the lower Mississippi? What is \$10 million for the Los Angeles school district; \$2.5 million for natural gas utilization; \$10 million for natural gas vehicles; \$10 million for electrical vehicles? The list goes on and on, Madam President.

What I am saying is that they had nothing to do with defense. They should have been rescinded and, unfortunately, they were not.

Mr. President, \$11 million for seismic research, that incorporated research institutions; \$20 million for National Center for Manufacturing Sciences; \$5.4 million for Hawaii, small business development center; \$1 million for Saltsburg Remediation Center, whatever that might be; an additional \$15 million for electrical computers; \$4 million, Institute for Advanced Flexible Manufacturing Systems; \$5 million for nursing research; \$1 million for the Police Research Institute.

I might add, that was put in in conference, never scrutinized in any authorization procedure or appropriations procedure on the floor.

Another \$1 million for the southwestern Oregon narcotics task force. Again, not in either bill; \$18.5 million for a mental health care demonstration project at Fort Bragg, NC, with an open-ended pricing program growth clause.

The list goes on and on, Madam President. The fact is that we should stop it. We had an opportunity to do away with some of, at least, the \$6.3 billion that I had sent and recommended to the Appropriations Committee, and I hope that in the years to come, we will try to exercise significantly more discipline.

Also, we proposed rescissions of \$352 million which was appropriated for earmark for surface transportation projects which do not necessarily represent either Federal, State, or local priorities. We should have rescinded any unobligated moneys, in my view.

The VA-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995 included \$290 million in special-purpose grants. According to estimates, only \$7 million of this funding has been properly authorized.

Examples of projects funded in that bill which should have been rescinded is \$450,000 for the construction of the Center for Political Participation; \$750,000 for the Sci-Trek Science Center to create a mezzanine level in its building to increase exhibit space in downtown Atlanta; \$1.45 million to the College of Notre Dame in Baltimore, MD, for capital costs, including equipping and outfitting activities in connection with renovation of the science center; and \$2 million for the De Paul University library to provide direct services and partnerships with community organizations, schools and individuals.

Madam President, my point here is many of these programs are good programs. Many of them are even needed programs. The question is, are they needed to the degree where we should fund them out of taxpayers' dollars, unauthorized? And sometimes they even did not go through the appropriations process. They clearly did not undergo the scrutiny that was necessary.

I would like to thank the committee for adopting language to rescind wastewater treatment earmarks put in last year. I also appreciate the committee's restriction on the expenditure of \$19 million which was earmarked to construct a footbridge to Ellis Island, a bridge that was opposed by the National Park Service. The committee has agreed to hold up that money until an environmental impact statement on the project is completed. I think this is a prudent and responsible action, and I commend them.

Mr. President, the committee should also be commended for making a number of spending cuts that exceed the House reduction. In fact, the Senate cuts more than the House in 61 programs.

I might point out that in several accounts, including highway demonstration projects and local library programs, the Senate rescission does not even equal cuts recommended by President Clinton. I think the Senate can and should do better, and I will offer an amendment later to restore rescissions requested by the President.

I have been examining the bill in detail since it came out on Monday, having been marked up in committee last Friday. I am curious about a number of items that remain funded in the bill. I wonder if I might ask the managers several questions.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in questions and answers with the manager of the bill, the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask my friend from Washington, on page 6 of the House report, which I do not expect the Senator from Washington to have, I will quote it to him.

The House rescission bill on page 6 said:

The committee recommends a rescission of \$12,678,000 in the Agriculture Research Service buildings and facilities program. These

funds were appropriated for the construction of a swine research center. Additional construction cost requirements for this facility are about \$13 million. The Agriculture Research Service currently conducts swine research in at least 13 different Federal facilities at a cost of over \$26 million. Many of these programs and facilities are ongoing projects. The agency has no plans to abolish or move existing research and researchers to the proposed swine center if it is constructed. The Department of Agriculture has estimated this facility would cost about \$10 million annually to operate.

Existing legislation directs the downsizing of the Federal work force. Therefore, providing additional researchers for this facility would cause adverse effects in research elsewhere.

Critical swine research could be carried out at an existing ARS facility at considerably less cost than providing an additional facility at a time when USDA is closing facilities and reducing staff.

I ask my friend from Washington if he knew of that action that was taken by the House and perhaps tell me where the facility is located and what that facility would do, if he has information.

Mr. GORTON. I may say to my friend from Arizona that I have the House report here in front of me. My page 6 deals with the Department of State international organizations—

Mr. MCCAIN. The bottom of page 7, top of page 8.

Mr. GORTON. Again, I answer my friend from Arizona in the following fashion: I do not see the Senator from Iowa on the floor, though I suspect he will be back soon. I think he or the Senator from Mississippi can better answer the Senator from Arizona. This Senator is here in anticipation of an amendment by the Senator from Arizona on the subject of the Interior Department Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I intended, in connection with the offsets, to defer most of the debate to those who were familiar with the program.

I do notice the Senator from Mississippi here. The Senator from Mississippi is now on the floor. He is the manager of the portion of the bill dealing with the Department of Agriculture, and I think he can probably better deal with that question.

Madam President, the Senator from Arizona has asked a question about a rescission included on page 7 of the House committee report with respect to the construction of the swine research center and has asked for its justification.

I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi would prefer to answer that question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I am happy to point out that in this part of the bill, there were several changes in the funding that the House had included in its legislation. There are a number of buildings and facilities and accounts. If I remember, this is in the Agricultural Research Service part of the bill. I am operating on memory now. I was watching the television monitor when I

heard the Senator from Arizona pose the question about this facility in Iowa. My recollection is that the House rescinded funds for this project and we rejected this proposal and instead took funds not needed for another project. The House bill also recommended funding for a number of projects in the Cooperative State Research Service buildings and facilities account be rescinded, and we decided not to go along with any of them as a class.

The reason for it is, No. 1, I do not think the administration requested those rescissions. No. 2, to go back through all of the CSRS buildings and facilities projects halfway through the year and try to pick out a few to cancel, in effect, or rescind funds at this time in the year, would have imposed quite a task on the committee in terms of reevaluating all projects in that bill.

We looked at the overall approach as one where, first of all, the administration's request for rescissions totaling \$142 million in the Public Law 480 accounts struck us as something that we should recommend for approval. The House recommended only a \$20 million reduction in funding for title III. Our recommendation is for a \$142 million reduction, which is what the administration requested.

We tried to make an independent judgment based on the facts as we understood them. Our committee had already looked at this proposal for the research facility in Iowa and decided it was meritorious. The committee had agreed, the Senate had agreed, the House had agreed, and the President had signed the bill appropriating the funds for it.

We decided not to go back and make a second guess at whether or not the House was justified in its decision. We decided to leave it for a discussion with the House in conference. We will review that in conference. I will be interested in hearing what the arguments are. I have consulted with Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa. He told me he strongly recommended the continuation of this funding, and I agreed with him.

So that is, in a nutshell, the process by which I reviewed that account and decided to recommend to the Appropriations Committee that we not agree with the House on that rescission.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. GORTON. Did not the Senator from Mississippi inform the entire Appropriations Committee that total rescissions falling within his jurisdiction were, by percentage, either the highest, or one of the highest, of any of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. If the Senator will yield, I do recall that we are recommending more outlay savings than the House, by far. Almost three times as much in outlay savings will be realized from the recommendations under the agriculture and related agencies title of this bill than will be achieved if

the Senate had gone along with all of the recommendations of the House.

So we have differences of opinion. They recommended a rescission of all of the funds appropriated for the Farmers' Home Section 515 rural rental housing program. We decided not to do that. We refused to go along with that. The administration did not request a rescission of those funds, and we thought that it would be unfair to stop in the middle of the year and eliminate all the money that was going to be available for that rural housing program. It is important in many parts of the country.

So I will say to my distinguished friend from Arizona, he can go through this bill and pick and choose and isolate and identify specific areas where we disagreed with the House. We did not rubberstamp what the House has suggested. We seriously and carefully considered every provision in the House bill, however. But we came to some different conclusions. We think we brought our best efforts to bear on that challenge and, in a responsible way, made recommendations to the full committee on appropriations.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I understand and appreciate the hard work of the Senator from Mississippi and the Members of the Appropriations Committee. But it is also the right and, in my view, the responsibility of those of us who also are Members of this body to look at these provisions. And as I discussed before the Senator from Mississippi came on the floor, when there are billions of dollars appropriated for defense that have no relation to defense, and when I see things like—for example, included is a recommendation for rescission which is only \$93,000. But if the Appropriations Committee did not see fit to rescind it for the National Potato Trade and Tariff Association, then obviously there is a certain degree of cynicism about some of the things that I see in the appropriations bills.

Also, the House recommended that the funding for certain agricultural research centers be rescinded. Among them were a poultry science facility, alternative pest control center, a chemistry building, aquatic research facility, center for applied aquaculture, science facility, southeast research station, food science facility, and the list goes on and on—a plant bioscience facility, \$3 million for a botanical garden.

I suggest very respectfully to my colleagues that if the State wants to build a botanical garden, I do not see why they should not build it themselves. A grain storage research extension center. A horse science and teaching center—that is one I do not understand at all. A horse science and teaching center. I do not know if we are teaching horses or if we are learning about the science of horses. Either way, I think we have probably explored that issue fairly extensively in the last couple hundred years. A biocontainment facil-

ity; a wheat research facility; an environmental simulation facility.

It all has to do, Madam President, with the role of Government. Do we spend money on these projects, such as a horse science and teaching center and a center for applied agriculture? Do we allow the State and local governments to do it, or does the Federal Government do it?

If the Federal Government does it and that is the judgment of this body, that is fine. But then I have an additional problem because what we have done is left programs like this in and taken other programs such as native Americans out.

That is the subject of my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 424 TO AMENDMENT NO. 420

(Purpose: To make adjustments to certain rescissions)

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] proposes an amendment numbered 424 to amendment No. 420.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue reading the amendment.

On page 4, line 20, strike "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$14,178,000".

On page 5, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103-330 and other Acts, \$20,994,000 are rescinded.

On page 19, line 12, strike "\$11,350,000" and insert "\$8,250,000".

On page 19, strike lines 20 through 23.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the amendment would rescind over \$12.5 million for construction of a swine research facility and nearly \$21 million which are construction feasibility study funds not yet obligated.

The House rescissions bill removed these funds. The Senate bill under consideration would restore these funds.

Madam President, this amendment would also restore funding for the \$5 million to Indian programs. I would describe those Indian programs which have been cut which I seek to be restored.

I cannot improve upon the case made in the House committee report for cutting \$12.678 million, and I described earlier the House report for the construction of a swine research center. Additional cost requirements stated in the report for this facility are about \$13 million. They also mention the cost of about \$10 million annually to operate.

It also points out that there is swine research being conducted in at least 13 different Federal facilities at a cost of over \$26 million.

On a Cooperative State Research Services building facilities program, the House report notes that there is a current backlog of \$400 million to complete facility construction projects already in the pipeline.

The bill provides for 15 new feasibility studies and this amendment, which would conform with the House bill, would rescind all funds not yet obligated and stop all feasibility studies.

I have two reasons for offering the amendment. First, I support the Senate rescission bill that meets the House-passed rescission bill. In light of the need for significant deficit reduction, I believe the Senate can and hopefully should be able to reach the goal.

Second, the cutting of \$12.7 million and \$20.1 million low-priority projects permits the Senate to restore \$5 million in Indian programs rescinded by the Senate bill, which Indian programs I believe are not appropriate for rescission.

Over the years I have served on the Committee on Indian Affairs, I have come to the painful yet very certain conclusion that Indian programs have been the last to be funded and the first to be cut.

Last month, the Congressional Research Service provided the Committee on Indian Affairs with a study that showed in graphic form how the disparity in per capita Federal expenditures between Indians and non-Indians, which first became negative for Indians in 1985, has steadily worsened since then, and further deteriorates in the fiscal year 1995 enacted appropriations.

Consequently, in recent weeks, as the 1995 rescission efforts have quickened in Congress, I have told Indian tribes on every occasion that I believe many of the proposed rescissions on Indian programs are a bad idea and that I oppose them.

The Senate bill already adequately addresses some of the House proposed cuts of tribal court funds, the Indian business development grants, and an amount sufficient to permit construction of the Indian Museum Cultural Center to proceed.

I strongly support efforts to maintain funding for these accounts so long as they are offsetting reductions from lower priority programs. In addition, I believe there are other lower priority projects or programs that should be cut, rather than the \$5 million in several BIA accounts.

The amendment would restore \$5 million in Indian funds and rescind and offset \$12.7 million from the swine research facility. The \$5 million is comprised of four items in the BIA operation of Indian programs and Indian direct loan program accounts.

The Indian self-determination fund: These indirect cost fundings are currently needed by tribes under self-determination and self-governance con-

tracts and compacts to administer formerly Federal activities.

Last year, Congress passed Public Law 103-413 to encourage expanded tribal assumption of BIA programs as the Federal bureaucracy is downsized. I am concerned the cuts will deter expanded contracting and compacting. In addition, for the past 2 years, tribes have borne unreimbursed shortfalls in indirect costs because tribes spent funds under cost plans approved by the Interior Department inspector general, but later could not collect reimbursement from the BIA because funding had not kept pace.

The second program is a community reservation economic development grant of \$600,000. Federal economic development funds, properly administered and distributed, are absolutely vital to restoring the grossly underdeveloped physical, economic, and social infrastructure of American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

This important program was begun in 1992 as a 5-year pilot program when 34 tribal proposals were competitively selected from 148 tribal applications. Most grants are used as seed funds to leverage additional funding. The grants ranged from a low of \$27,000. Fiscal year 1995 total enacted level for this program is \$5.945 million.

Indian rights protection, \$500,000. In the context of the Department's vast trust responsibility to protect, maintain, and manage Indian resources, these funds offer only minimal assistance to support reservation and native community level efforts to protect property rights.

Included in this account are funds for reserved water rights negotiation/litigation and settlement expenses, funds to uphold the directives protecting native allotments prescribed in the Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and funds to fulfill the investigation and certification mandates of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

The last program would be the Indian Direct Loan Program of \$1.9 million. This account provides loans to tribes, Indian organizations, and individual Indian for-profit enterprises under the Indian Financing Act.

Fiscal year 1995 total enacted level for this account is \$2.479 million, which through a subsidy arrangement is expected to leverage up to \$10 million in direct loans this year, unless rescinded.

Madam President, I absolutely believe we must place short constraints on appropriations in this and following fiscal years. The amendment would restore less than one-half of the Indian program rescissions proposed in the Senate bill, and it would make offsetting cuts in the construction of the swine research facility in the cooperative State Research Service buildings and facilities account.

These Indian programs are an extremely important expression of the solemn government-to-government relationship the United States and this

Congress has with American Indian and Alaskan Native tribal governments.

I believe we can achieve significant cuts in fiscal year 1995 spending, and we can do so even as we carry out our obligation to ensure that the lowest priority projects are cut first before Indian projects.

I want to point out again, Madam President, I am seeking a restoration of approximately half of the Indian cuts that were made in Indian programs in this rescission bill.

If we look at the cuts that were made in Indian programs as a portion of the entire budget, we will find, as usual, that the cuts in Indian programs is a much higher percentage than any other cuts, rescissions, that have been made.

I am seeking to restore four vital programs that are important to the well-being of Native Americans and the fulfillment of our solemn treaty obligations.

I might add, Madam President, having been down here on numerous occasions and embarked on efforts like these, I probably will not win this amendment, this vote. I probably will lose it. But it is very difficult for me to go back to the native Americans and tell them that I did not at least try to restore the funds that I believe are necessary to try to help the one group of Americans whose conditions are worse than any other group of Americans.

I will not recite the statistics concerning diabetes, alcoholism, child abuse, and all the other horrible and graphic statistics that afflict Indian country, because I have done that before and I am sure I will probably do that in the future.

I feel that in keeping with my obligation to them as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, I cannot, in good conscience, not seek a restoration of the funding for at least those most vital programs.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I question the ruling of the Chair on the request for the seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is now a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona has pointed out, this amendment has two quite separate and distinct parts. And of course, the arguments relating to those two separate and distinct parts are quite separate from one another as well.

The Senator from Arizona has fought a long and often lonely fight with respect to many items and many appropriations bills. He was quite eloquent, just a few moments ago, on the misuse of the defense appropriations bill for nondefense items, and went through quite a number of them. Yet this

amendment does not deal with an offset from the defense budget for nondefense items. But, for some reason or another, it takes on the agricultural appropriations bill which, as has already been pointed out by the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, has in it an amount of rescissions far greater than those proposed by the House and I think proportionately as high as any portion of this rescissions bill. So let me speak very, very briefly to those agricultural projects because I know the Senators, both from Iowa and Mississippi, will do so themselves.

At least a significant number of the Cooperative State Research Service proposals here are for money for facilities which are in the process of being constructed, and where the removal of the money might well cause a cessation of those construction projects.

It is, I am certain, for exactly that reason the Senator from Mississippi did not wish to go along with the House of Representatives. Because there will be differences on each one of these issues, a conference committee may well determine that some of the studies for new projects, which might be very expensive, should be dismissed—should be eventually rescinded. But the Senator from Mississippi—

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORTON. Did not wish to deal just with those items. He was faced with a set of rescissions at varying levels of study and of actual construction. He and the Senator from Iowa can deal with other matters, but the swine research facility is one that will be before a conference committee along with all the other cuts and reductions, where members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture can determine a priority order of rescissions, designed to meet the very real goal of this rescissions bill.

I think sometime during the course of this afternoon, not only Members, but the general public may have lost track of the extraordinary nature of this bill. I do not believe there is a Senator alive who has dealt in the middle of a fiscal year with the rescission of so many billions of dollars as this one does, in order to make at least a modest downpayment on balancing our Federal budget. It seems to me the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture deserves a great deal of credit for being willing to rescind a wide range of appropriations which, just a few months ago, he felt were appropriate.

Let me also speak, of course, to the other side of the equation and that is the \$5 million restoration for the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerns. Unlike the agricultural section of this bill, where the Senate rescissions are greater than the House rescissions in total for Indian purposes in general, the Senate rescissions are less and fewer than the House rescissions. When I, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, was faced with a table of what the House had done, it had, I must say,

fewer rescissions than we ended up with for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

But the No. 1 goal of those who were concerned with and sensitive to Indian affairs, Madam President, was not the particular line items for the BIA, which, of course, is bitterly criticized by many of its purported beneficiaries, but was directed at the total rescission of all money for the National Museum of the American Indian—two facilities which have been planned and promised, one storage facility in Suitland and a museum on The Mall here in Washington, DC.

Another part of this bill for the Smithsonian Institution restores almost \$20 million for this year's progress in the creation of that National Museum for the American Indian. It seemed to me in making that restoration we needed some balance from other Indian appropriations, and for that reason, many of those which are the object of this amendment were included. But the total of all of the additional rescissions for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Madam President, is nowhere near the amount restored for the museum.

Granted, the beneficiaries are different. There is no question about that. But we did not go dollar for dollar any more than the Senator from Mississippi did. He rescinded more dollars than he restored. In our case we rescinded fewer dollars than we restored, in the broad sense of the term—matters of great interest to the native American communities of this country. In fact, of the \$5 million which the Senator from Arizona seeks to restore, \$1.9 million, almost 40 percent, is for a program which the President in his budget for next year has recommended zero dollars. So all we are doing here is anticipating the recommendations of the President of the United States—these are Indian direct loans—because there is another guarantee, there is a guaranteed loan program for Indians. And in each of the other cases, we are dealing—which is not the case with all of these agricultural rescissions—with unobligated funds in smaller amounts than had originally been intended and in much smaller amounts than the otherwise total of rescissions for Indian matters.

So I suppose it is possible to say that in one or more of the four objects of restoration here, we might have done a better job. But I know I have been approached by many Senators from my part of the country, as has the Senator from Mississippi, protesting individual rescissions while in general terms, as is the case with the Senator from Arizona, feeling that, if anything, we have not cut out enough spending overall. But the spending that we have not cut off overall almost always seems to be spending in an area which is not of much interest to that particular Senator; and the areas which are of interest are matters of great sacrifice.

So I hope we have been reasonably sensitive in this case, to native Amer-

ican concerns. I know that we have been more generous to them than was the House of Representatives. And I know that the Senator from Mississippi was tougher on agriculture, overall, than was the House of Representatives. I do not think that we should, by this amendment, exacerbate or make worse differences which already exist.

So, Madam President, with regret I oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I will be brief. First, I hope the Senator from Washington will note these funds do not go to the BIA; they are not BIA programs. They go direct to the tribes. I think that is an important distinction, particularly after he mentions the well-justified criticism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Second, if the Senator is correct, that much of this money has already been spent and allocated, I do not quite understand the statement in the House bill that says there is a backlog of \$400 million, necessary to complete facilities already in the pipeline; so that is of some interest. And fiscal year 1995 provides for 15 new feasibility studies. According again to the House report, the Agricultural Research Service currently conducts swine research in at least 13 different facilities at a cost of over \$26 million, and this facility would cost \$10 million annually to operate.

The Senator from Washington alluded to something about programs in individuals' areas or States. I would point out to him these Indian programs are national programs. They have no particular affiliation with my State.

I do not intend to drag out this amendment or the debate. I know that the Senator from Iowa will, with his usual passion and articulate presentation, defend this program, and I will, before he even speaks, say I respect and admire his continued commitment to his State and agriculture and how important it is to his State as well as that of swine research.

So I do not intend to extend this debate, and I appreciate the time of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, careful consideration was given to the formation of the National Swine Research Center.

A national peer panel recommended the establishment of the Swine Research Center because the needed research was not being conducted in any other State or Federal laboratory nationwide.

The program of research is not duplicative.

The mission of the research center is to develop technology to ensure that the U.S. pork industry operates as an environmentally sound and efficient animal production system.

It will help maintain and increase the competitiveness and efficiency of U.S. pork production and marketing.

This is the answer which the Agricultural Research Service of the USDA gave in response to a question from the House Agriculture Appropriations Committee.

Concerns expressed by Members of the House of Representatives have not been about the facility itself or the research that it will conduct.

Their concerns have been with the outyear funding of research.

The ARS and the pork producers are currently working on this and are making a good faith attempt to consolidate swine research programs in the future to reduce program funding requirements.

Pork production is on the increase in many States.

The research at this center will help pork producers nationwide.

ARS has no swine research projects in the areas of waste management, marketing, economics, housing, management, human health, or swine health, welfare, and behavior in production systems.

Permit me to try to answer the key questions about the National Swine Research Center.

NATIONAL SWINE RESEARCH CENTER FACILITY JUSTIFICATION

What national strategic issues are associated with pork production?

Conservative projections indicate that the United States, in an environment of trade liberalization and increased demand, will have an opportunity to triple its pork exports, currently 262,000 tons), in the next 10 to 15 years. At that level, the impact would be the creation of 36,000 U.S. jobs and \$1.1 billion in income, U.S. input-output model. Other parts of the world, including areas in Europe and South America, are poised to take advantage of this opportunity.

What are the barriers to growth in U.S. pork production and pork exports?

Major barriers to growth in U.S. pork production are related to manure management/nutrient utilization, odor control, water quality, employee health, animal well-being, and housing and food safety questions associated with increased pork production. Current USDA facilities are not designed to research these questions; nor are they staffed by scientists with the expertise to study them; nor is it feasible to convert them for the type of research the industry urgently needs.

What are the social concerns associated with increased pork production?

Our society places a high value on environmental quality, water quality, protection from odors associated with swine production, worker health, and animal well-being. At a 1994 international meeting of experts on odor perception and odor production, scientists agreed that the difficulty of obtaining objective measures of odors was a serious problem for the swine industry.

We must develop systems that allow U.S. producers to be competitive while meeting our Nation's social and environmental expectations.

How can these problems be solved?

A national group, including representatives from major pork-producing States and the public and private sectors, examined the opportunities and threats facing U.S. pork production. These group recommended the establishment of the National Swine Research Center, concluding that a unique new swine research center was required to provide the conditions for addressing complex, systems-based issues of critical importance to the survival and growth of the Nation's pork production sector.

Why should a public institution conduct this research?

The center will focus on the type of research that is best suited to public institutions. Private sector incentives to conduct such research are inadequate; advances are likely to be widely useful within the United States; and results will provide a national strategic advantage in pork production with positive impacts on rural development, the national economy, and the Nation's balance of trade.

RESEARCH PROGRAM SUMMARY

Research at the National Swine Research Center will focus on environmental quality, including water and air quality, utilization of manure, and housing designs to improve conditions for rearing swine and preventing human health problems.

In addition to areas of research already described in this document, proposed projects include:

Development of manure-based soil amendments for urban use,

Separation/concentration/drying/fermentation technologies for manure,

Methods to store and handle manure, Production of biomass energy crops with organic fertilizer, and

Production of methane from manure.

The center will be the source of creative new research on a wide range of production, health, environmental, and socioeconomic issues that must be resolved to support U.S. producers' bid to claim a substantial share of growth in the world market for pork.

Finally, this is a list of current major ARS swine research projects:

USDA-ARS PROGRAM ON SWINE RESEARCH

In FY 1995, \$26.1 million was appropriated for ARS to conduct swine research at 13 ARS locations. The areas of swine research currently pursued are: foreign animal diseases; domestic animal diseases; reproduction; food safety; nutrition; systems; parasites; stress; pork quality; genetics; and growth. ARS has no swine projects in the areas of waste management, marketing, economics, housing, management, human health, or swine health, welfare, and behavior in production systems.

CURRENT MAJOR AREAS OF RESEARCH ON SWINE IN ARS

Genetics (Beltsville, MD, Clay Center, NE) Development of genomic map; identify genes associated with disease resistance; identify animals with superior reproductive capacity.

Reproduction (Athens, GA, Beltsville, MD) Sorting of male and female sperm cells; cryopreservation of gametes and embryos; neuroendocrine regulation of reproduction; genetic and physiological factors that influence litter size.

Nutrition and Growth (Athens, GA, Beltsville, MD, Clay Center, NE, Columbia, MO, Fayetteville, AR) Neuroendocrine and bioregulation of physiological and genetic factors that influence fat and protein metabolism; endocrine control studies to increase the lean and reduce the fat in pork.

Domestic Diseases (Ames, IA, Peoria, IL) Viral-induced reproductive diseases; enteric diseases; bacterial and microbiological factors that influence the level of disease and production efficiency

Foreign Animal Disease (Greenport, NY) Foot-and-mouth disease; African swine fever.

Parasites (Beltsville, MD) Identification of swine resistant to parasites; epidemiology and vaccines; diagnostic methods for trichinosis and toxoplasmosis.

Pork Quality and Stress (Beltsville, MD, Clay Center, NE, Columbia, MO, New Orleans, LA, W. Lafayette, IN) Improve baby pig survival by reducing stress and environmental factors; breed and diet effect on quantity, quality, and composition of pork; metabolic regulation of fat synthesis.

Food Safety (Albany, CA, College Station, TX, Clay Center, NE, Wyndmoor, PA) Rapid test to identify drug and antibiotic residues; microbiological safety of port carcasses and pork products; control of pathogenic and spoilage bacteria on meat.

I do feel the managers of this bill want to get to a vote soon. I believe with the forceful response that the Senator from Washington just gave as to the wrongness of the amendment by the Senator from Arizona, plus the defense of this decision of the subcommittee on this specific swine research center, I do not need to add a great deal to how unjustified the amendment is that is offered at this point.

I will simply make a couple points, one in regard to the Federal Government's involvement in agriculture research. It has been a policy of the Federal Government since 1862, with the establishment of the land grant universities, to have the Federal Government very deeply involved in agricultural research and education to enhance the productivity of our farms and to enhance the quality of the product of our farms. That research is much more sophisticated today than it was 132 years ago. That research must still continue to go on to keep our agricultural industry competitive.

It happens that there is a research facility proposed at Iowa State University. There are swine research facilities located at other universities, or research centers. The one established at Iowa State University is not duplicative. I have an official response from ARS on that that I am going to read in closing.

It should not be surprising to anybody that the Iowa State University would be very deeply involved in agriculture research in the first place and even specializing to a considerable extent in swine research because my State is first in the production of corn,

my State is either first or second to Illinois in the production of soybeans, and we are No. 1, way beyond any other State, in the production of pork. One out of every four pigs in America reside in my State. We are a massive pork producing State. And Iowa State University is right in the middle of it. So nobody should be surprised whatsoever if there is a determination made by a national organization, the Congress, following up on proposals by outstanding research groups in America that we need to do specific research in a specific aspect of the swine industry that might be located at Iowa State University.

That is the history of agricultural research. I wish to speak to a specific point, and I am just going to read a short statement on this point, about the suggestion by the Senator from Arizona that there is so much swine research already, why do you need another swine research facility?

Well, the simple answer to that is the different specializations of the different facilities around the United States. I could give a long list, but I will not bother to do so, of what research has been done. But a Congressman from my State, Mr. LATHAM, had an opportunity to ask the Agricultural Research Service this question:

The National Swine Research Center—

And that is the one that the Senator from Arizona proposes to delete. I wish to start over again. Mr. LATHAM asked the question:

The National Swine Research Center has been criticized on the basis that it will conduct duplicative research. What is your opinion on the research mission of the center and do you think it is duplicative?

This is the response from the Agricultural Research Service of the USDA to the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee:

A national peer panel recommended—

I wish to stop just a minute. The reason I wish to emphasize, "A national peer panel recommended," this is not some Congressman or Senator getting something for their particular State. This was a studied approach.

A national peer panel recommended the establishment of the National Swine Research Center because the needed research was not being conducted at any other State or Federal laboratory nationwide. The program of research will not be duplicative. The mission of the National Swine Research Center is to develop technology to ensure that the U.S. pork industry operates as an environmentally sound and efficient animal production system. It will help maintain and increase the competitiveness and efficiency of the U.S. pork production and market.

I hope those are adequate responses to the supposed justification of the Senator from Arizona for this deletion so that my colleagues will not rescind this project and that we will move forward.

If we make a decision to move forward, I wish to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said. We are only going back to conference with the House and take a sec-

ond look at this. My judgment is a second look based upon the recommendation of a national peer panel will show that this is not duplicative and it is needed, particularly in the area of cleaning up the environment and having an environmentally sound pork producing system; that this will move forward.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise very briefly to support the position of the appropriators here and oppose the amendment. I do it on the basis the Senator from Washington pointed out, and that is some of these projects have been under way or are in the midst of getting under way. The one I have particular interest in is the environmental simulator that is designed to study the aspects of hazardous materials moving through soil. And it does it in a very abbreviated way. It is something that pertains to what we are seeking in this country. And so, Mr. President, I rise briefly to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself strongly with the comments made by my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, regarding this pending amendment. I think he hit the nail right on the head when he read the letter from the Agricultural Research Service regarding the importance of this swine research center and the fact it is not duplicative of other research and facilities. The kind of research that is going to be done there is not being done anywhere else in the country.

There has been a lot of comment made on that this kind of research is done elsewhere. Quite frankly, it is not.

Mr. President, I understand the desire of the Senator from Arizona to put more money into two accounts funding American Indian programs. I am not fully familiar with them. I am sure he has some legitimate arguments why that funding is necessary.

I would suggest, however, that the Senator from Arizona has gone after wrong accounts to get the money. Because he has gone after some research projects that are important to us nationally; research projects that are important not only for the producers in this country but for our consumers also.

We have a long, proud history of Federal support for research in this country, especially agricultural research, going clear back to Abraham Lincoln's time.

That support for agricultural research is a key factor providing us an abundance of the most wholesome, most varied food at the lowest price of any nation. About 8 cents of every dollar of disposable income an American family has goes to buy the food they

consume at home. You cannot match that figure anywhere in the world. We have not only the most variety and the largest quantity of foods, but they are the healthiest and the cheapest.

These benefits have been brought about, in substantial part, by the agricultural research that has been done in this country. A lot of this research is not the easiest to understand. There is a lot of sophisticated work being done to improve agricultural productivity, to expand markets and uses for agricultural commodities, to improve the competitiveness of U.S. agriculture in world markets, and also to reduce the impact of agriculture on the environment while at the same time maintaining productivity.

This is no time to be cutting this vital agricultural research. Speaking only for myself, I believe we are not putting enough into agricultural research as it is. For example, USDA formula funds for land grant universities have been essentially flat in dollar amounts since 1983, meaning universities have lost 20 to 25 percent of their research purchasing power since 1983.

Agricultural research is a good investment. Studies have shown that the return on investment in agriculture research has been in the area of about 20 to 25 percent.

And let us keep in mind that a relatively small share of Federal research and development funding actually goes to agricultural research and development. According to the National Science Foundation, for 1994, only 2 percent of the total Federal research and development dollars went to agriculture. Of the total Federal dollars for basic research, only 4 percent went to agriculture.

So again, while these proposed cuts may seem small in the magnitude of the billions of dollars we are talking about, they are large when you compare them to the relatively small amount of actual research dollars that go to agriculture.

As I said, this research is sophisticated work; it is highly specialized. And that can sometimes make it easy to attack or to poke fun at.

Well, there was even a television show one night that referred to funding for the Swine Research Center, very jokingly saying, "Well, this is the ultimate pork, isn't it, Federal dollars going to pork research?"

Well, I suppose it got a lot of laughs and people who did not know what it was about can laugh about it.

But the fact is, the pork industry in America is no laughing matter. There are over 200,000 pork producers in this country. The pork industry generates over \$66 billion in economic activity and supports about 764,000 jobs directly and indirectly and adds nearly \$26 billion of value to production inputs. Annual farm sales of hogs are usually more than \$11 billion, and retail sales of pork are more than \$30 billion each year.

In fact, farm receipts from sales of hogs place the industry in fourth or fifth place among all agricultural commodities that we produce in this country. So it is a very important industry. It is very important for our producers. It is important for our consumers. It is important for our Nation.

Some of the important issues that will be researched at the Swine Research Center include how pork production can be made more efficient and how we can solve some of the environmental problems of pork production.

The research will include studies by soil, plant, and animal scientists into enhancing both the competitiveness and the environmental soundness of the pork industry.

There is currently, as my colleague from Iowa pointed out, no other State or Federal facility capable of addressing the unique research planned for this center.

The Agricultural Research Service has identified this project as a high priority. It is the result of joint planning and continuing efforts by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service, the National Pork Producers Council, Iowa State University, and the Iowa Pork Producers Association.

As Senator GRASSLEY pointed out, there was peer review, a national peer review, not just regional or State.

So for these reasons, it is important that we continue our commitment to agricultural research in general and to the Cooperative State Research Service and to the Agricultural Research Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a fact sheet from the National Pork Producers Council, entitled "A Profile of Today's Pork Industry."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROFILE OF TODAY'S PORK INDUSTRY

The U.S. pork industry is experiencing unprecedented growth. More pork was produced in the U.S. in 1992 than ever before, and 1993 was nearly as large. Over 17 billion pounds will again be processed from just under 93 million hogs in 1994.

The economic impact of the industry on rural America is immense. Farm receipts from hogs place the industry in 4th or 5th position [depending on the year] among all farm commodities. Annual farm sales usually exceed \$11 billion, while the retail value of pork sold to consumers exceeds \$30 billion.

And the pork industry benefits more than just farmers! Pork production means jobs and economic opportunity for thousands of rural communities. The "value added" nature of pork provides employment well beyond the farm. Based on a 1993 study by researchers at Iowa State University, the U.S. pork industry is responsible for over \$66 billion dollars in total domestic economic activity. Through direct, indirect and induced effects, the pork industry supports 764,080 jobs and adds nearly \$26 billion dollars of value to production inputs. Given these figures, the pork industry's major contribution to local, state and national economies and governments (through tax revenues) is obvious.

Approximately 200,000 pork producers are in business today compared to nearly three million in 1950. Farms have grown in size—nearly 80 percent of the hogs are grown on farms producing 1000 or more hogs per year. These operations, which are often more technically sophisticated, are still predominantly individual family farms.

The geographic location of pork production is shifting as well. While the traditional Corn Belt represents the overwhelming share of production, growth is also occurring in "nontraditional" hog states such as Texas, Colorado, and Oklahoma. North Carolina, which ranked 14th in pork production 30 years ago, now ranks 2nd among states.

The global market offers tremendous growth potential for U.S. pork producers. With many of the world's most cost-efficient producers, the U.S. pork industry still only sells about 2 percent of total production overseas. Yet pork is the world's "meat of choice" by far, with over 40 percent share of the world's meat protein market.

The National Pork Producers Council is the only national membership organization representing pork producers exclusively. The "Pork. The Other White Meat" promotion is well known. Funded by the national pork checkoff and paid for by producers, it is credited with having a major impact in improving pork's consumer image and helping improve pork demand. The checkoff also funds important research projects to improve pork's nutritional profile, overall quality and price.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, Mr. President, while I understand the desire of the Senator from Arizona to put more money into programs he feels very strongly about, this is not the time to turn our backs on the important agricultural research being done all over this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to table the McCain amendment.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona has agreed it can be done by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the McCain amendment.

So the motion to table the amendment (No. 424) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to use a portion of my leader's time.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWELL HEFLIN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in announcing his plans to not seek reelection, our distinguished colleague from Alabama, Senator HEFLIN, said today that he hopes he "will be looked upon as a public servant who has served with dignity, integrity, and diligence." In my view, those qualities speak volumes about Senator HOWELL HEFLIN.

From his highly decorated service in the U.S. Marine Corps in World War II, to his 6 years as chief justice of Alabama's Supreme Court, to his three terms in the U.S. Senate during which he held the thankless post of Ethics Committee chairman, this man affectionately known as the country judge from Tusculumbia, AL, has made a difference for America and the people of his State.

While we have not agreed on every issue, I have been proud to stand with my friend from Alabama time after time, whether it's been on the Desert Storm resolution, the flag protection amendment, the balanced budget amendment, regulatory reform, or one of countless other issues.

Mr. President, as Senator HEFLIN looks ahead to returning home to Alabama and more time with his wife, children, and grandchildren, I know all my colleagues join in wishing him all the best for the future. And I know that during that final 2 years of his term, he will continue to serve with the dignity, integrity, and diligence that have characterized his life in public service.

Mr. DOLE. Let me first announce there will be no more votes this evening. It is my understanding that the manager of the appropriations bill now pending indicates we will complete action on the bill maybe late tomorrow evening. That is the hope of the chairman, Senator HATFIELD.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Daniel Glickman to be Secretary of Agriculture, and that it be considered under the following agreement: 40 minutes to be equally divided in the usual form. I ask further that, when the Senate concludes its debate tonight, there be 10 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form, on Thursday, prior to vote on the confirmation of Mr. Glickman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.